

HOME NEWS.

PROMINENT ARRIVALS AT THE HOTELS.

BRUNSWICK—Colonel William Goddard, of Rhode Island, Fifth Avenue-Carroll D. Wright, of Washington, D. C.; William Barnes, Jr., of Albany; ex-Congressman Stephen C. Minkler, of Boston, of Philadelphia; GRAND UNION—Secretary of State John Palmer, of Albany. HOFFMAN—Ex-Postmaster-General Wilson S. Bissell, of Baltimore. METROPOLITAN—Senators Charles Davis and James Ballantine. PARK AVENUE—General Rufus H. King, of Albany. WADSWORTH—Adjutant-General E. A. McAlpin.

WHAT IS GOING ON TO-DAY.

Case of Lieutenant C. E. Lang before Army Retiring Board. Police Board meeting. Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, 7th Regiment Army, 8 p. m. Phi Beta Kappa Alumni, Waldorf, 8 p. m. Intercollegiate football conference, University Athletic Club. Genealogical and Biographical Society, No. 23 West Forty-fourth-st., 8:30 p. m. Company E, 8th Regiment, cycle races, armory, 8 p. m. Bicycle Show, Armory Hall, Brooklyn. Pictorial Club meeting, Sherry's, 8:35 p. m. Michaux Club entertainment, 8 p. m. Thirteen Club dinner, No. 192 Pearl-st., 7:15 p. m. Liberal Club meeting, No. 220 East Fifteenth-st., 8 p. m. German American Reform General Committee, Grand Central Palace, 8 p. m. Republican Union, No. 63 East Fifty-ninth-st., evening.

NEW-YORK CITY.

Commissioner Shields yesterday went to the home of Frederick J. Guerra, one of the alleged Cuban filibusters, who is ill, and took the accused man's ball bond for \$2,500 in cash. Guerra is held to appear in the Criminal Branch of the United States Circuit Court on March 23 next. James Malley, a member of the Centre Street Court police squad, died at his home, No. 96 Vesey-st., yesterday morning. It is said that he contracted a cold last Sunday while doing extra duty in the Elizabeth-st. precinct. This developed into pneumonia, which caused his death. The Rev. W. Hay Aiken, who preached in Trinity Church ten years ago, will preach there again every noon next week. The service will be informal, with singing by the congregation. The Round Table Club will have a dinner at Clark's, No. 22 West Twenty-third-st., to-morrow at 6:30 p. m., at which "The Widening World of Women" will be discussed. Mrs. James Scrimgeour, of Brooklyn, and the Rev. Duncan J. McMillan will be the principal speakers. The St. Patrick's Day dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick will be held this year at the Hotel Savoy at 6 o'clock. This will be the 112th anniversary of the society. "The Congregational Idea and Work" will be discussed by the Congregational Club on Monday at its dinner at the Hotel St. Denis. There will be a special half-hour Lenten service for business men and boys, consisting of the Litany, hymns and an address, in St. Paul's Chapel, Broadway and Vesey-st., at 12:30 o'clock to-day.

The Board of General Appraisers has found that importations of flax thread by Hughes Fawcett, representative of Stewart & Son, of Larnard, Ireland, were undervalued. Quality A was invoiced as quality F, which is one grade lower. Representatives of the H. B. Clavin Company, the William Young Cotton Company and a large Boston house testified that they imported thread of the same quality at the same valuation. There will be a further investigation by the General Appraisers. The annual indoor games of the 7th Regiment Athletic Association have been postponed from April 4 to April 11. All arrangements have been completed, so far as the programme and prizes are concerned.

The March "at home" of the Associate Alumnae of the Normal College will be held in the Alumnae library this afternoon, from 3 to 5 o'clock. Mrs. Brandes and Dr. Charles, of the class of '83, will pour tea. Magistrate Brann in Essex Market Court yesterday held Mrs. Sophia Goldman, accused of the homicide of seven-year-old Charles Shukalsky, for the action of the Coroner, without bail, on February 13 it is alleged that, in the course of a tenement-house squabble at No. 148 Forsyth-st., where they live, Mrs. Goldman struck the child on the head with a broomstick. Sprung meningitis developed a few weeks later, and on March 8 last the boy died from the injuries.

SEVEN WOMEN CLAIM HIM.

HOFFMANN IS CHARGED WITH BIGAMY ON COMPLAINT OF WIFE NO. 4 AND 5. Wolfe Hoffmann was arraigned in Essex Market Court yesterday on a charge of bigamy. The complaints were made by his fourth and fifth wives. Four other wives will appear as witnesses against him. Wife No. 1, married twenty-five years ago in Austria, at the examination set for to-day, will be represented by two adult sons. On Wednesday night Hoffmann had supper with wife No. 5 at 140 Ridge-st., while yesterday morning, when arrested by Police Officer Fitzgerald, he was wearing wife No. 4 to dress her three months' old baby at No. 28 Essex-st. Hoffmann is a tinsmith with a shop in Pearl-st., Brooklyn. His lawyer, who appears for one of the women, is responsible for the statement that Hoffmann is fairly well-to-do, and the possessor of real estate here and in Austria. In this prospect, the lawyer says, is without some property. Esther Levy, of No. 96 Columbia-st., who has nearly \$500 in the bank, on Saturday last announced her engagement to Hoffmann, and the wedding, now probably postponed, was to have taken place in April next. Hoffmann is said to have long been cognizant of each other's existence, and several of them are on visiting terms. Hoffmann's general demand for money to underwrite a repay wife No. 3 her dowry when she threatened to make him support her, and that of wife No. 4, who had been his legal rights. Individual reports were met with a statement that Hoffmann had a general offer of \$500 apiece for releases. The terms were not high enough, and at a meeting held by lawyer on Feb. 11, Hoffmann's course was decided upon. Four of the wives and the two sons of No. 1 were present. The court yesterday ordered the wife of Brann held Hoffmann in \$2,500 bonds for examination.

A JUDGMENT FOR THE GOULDS.

THE ASSESSMENT OF THE TAX COMMISSIONERS ON THEIR PROPERTY NOT SUSTAINED. An appeal was taken from the judgment of the Board of Tax Commissioners yesterday in setting an assessment of \$100,000 on property left under the will of Jay Gould, and in charge of executors and trustees, on \$100,000 held by Edwin Gould, \$50,000 held by George Gould, \$50,000 held by Helen Gould and \$100,000 by Howard Gould, for the year 1895. The appeal was made before Justice Pryor in the Supreme Court. The Goulds were represented by ex-Judge John F. Dillon, Almar Goodwin, Edward L. Parry, former Tax Commissioner, and Harry Hubbard. The judgment of the Commissioners was attacked on the ground that the Goulds were not residents of New-York. This was the ground which the Board of Tax Commissioners was reversed in 1893 and 1894, and it met the same fate yesterday. John F. Wood, the Assistant Corporation Counsel, said that there was no argument to be made, and that the proceedings were allowed to go to court as a matter of formality and record. Ex-Judge Dillon reviewed in brief the contention Russell decided in favor of the Goulds. Five contentions were set forth. George Gould was a resident of Lakewood, N. J., and that the other members of the family concerned were residents of Irvington, Westchester County. "The circumstances are the same this year, Your Honor," said ex-Judge Dillon. "Notwithstanding this the Commissioners have seen fit to levy assessments on the property of the Goulds." Justice Pryor promptly awarded judgment to the plaintiffs.

LOCAL BUSINESS COMPLICATIONS.

Deputy-Sheriff Mulvaney yesterday received an order granted by Judge McLean, of the Supreme Court, permitting the sale at auction on the 16th inst. of the effects of Durland's Riding Academy Company, at Sixth-st. and Central Park West, except book accounts. The sale will include eighty-nine saddle horses, saddles, blankets, stable implements, office fixtures, furniture, safes and wagons, and will be made on account of the first attachment for \$2,318, obtained by Charles P. Easton, assignee of Frazer & Co., hay merchants. The order for the sale was obtained on the ground of perishable property, as it is costing a considerable amount daily for keeping the horses, and the Sheriff did not want the responsibility on



The amount of your tailor's bill startles you. After a look at our suits and prices it would do more—chagrin you to think of the amount of money thrown away. What does the best custom tailor give—good cloth, stylish patterns, best trimmings, fit. So do we. Spring is at hand, a good time to reform. "Better late than never."

ROGERS PEET & CO. Prince and Broadway. Thirty-second and Broadway.

his hands. The attachments in the Sheriff's hands aggregate \$32,856. The schedules of Charles M. Cobb, doing business as W. C. Hodgkins, show liabilities, \$13,207; nominal assets, \$3,308; actual assets, \$5,514. At a meeting of creditors of R. S. Lippner & Co., wholesale dealers in auxiliary hardware at No. 67 Murray-st., whose business was established in 1811, a proposition was accepted for a compromise. The liabilities on the date payable on May 1, the liabilities on the date about \$12,000. Deputy Sheriff Loub has received an execution against Funder, stock broker, for \$4,535, in favor of William F. Moore, as assignee of De Mott & Durant. Ezekiel Fixman has been appointed receiver in supplementary proceedings for John W. Holling, real estate agent at Third-ave. and on the ground of insolvency, by Judge Beckman, of the Supreme Court.

WESTCHESTER COUNTY.

YONKERS. The new Memorial Committee of the Grand Army for 1896 composed of John C. Shotts, Augustus King, George R. Hendrickson, Abraham H. Tompkins, Edward J. Mitchell, John H. Rein, William L. Halsey, James Carter, Robert B. Light, William H. Fisher, Jerome Barnes, William E. Perkins, Edward A. Ryer, Thomas Oliver and M. J. Sullivan, of Kitching Post; Alexander O. Kirkwood, David A. Winans, John H. Keeler, James E. Odell, William Riley, C. E. V. Lewis, Theodore Van Ness, Samuel Archer and Luke Simpson, of John C. Freeman Post; John W. Pentreath, captain of John C. Shotts Camp, and Albert A. Sievers, captain of George R. McClellan Camp, Sons of Veterans. The committee met on Wednesday night and elected John C. Shotts, chairman; A. O. Kirkwood, vice-chairman; William H. Fisher, secretary, and James B. Odell, treasurer. On Wednesday evening a team from the Harlem Young Men's Christian Association met a team from the association here. The home team won both games. The March meeting of the Yonkers Clerical Association was held yesterday afternoon in the lecture room of the Wesleyan Methodist Episcopal Church. The subject discussed was "The Conduct of Pastors." A missionary address delivered in the lecture room of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church on Wednesday evening by Miss M. C. Williams, of China, an address by Mrs. Breen, with Mrs. J. D. Van Olanda, president; Mrs. Breen, first vice-president; Mrs. Cook, second vice-president; Mrs. Raymond, recording secretary; Mrs. Byrnes, corresponding secretary, and Mrs. Cooper, treasurer.

NEW-ROCHELLE.

Work on the trolley line will begin early in April. Much of the present efficiency of the New-Rochelle Public Library is due to the personal services of Albert C. Owen, of Centre-ave. L. G. Backus, the lawyer, moved into the law offices of C. E. Kent, in Main-st. Over eight hundred children are enrolled in the Trinity Street School. The election of the Huguenot Wheelmen was held on Friday of this week. The success for full ticket will go to R. K. Smith, for corresponding secretary, and J. M. L. Conn, for treasurer.

MOUNT VERNON.

The Mayor and Common Council gave a public hearing on the bill providing for certain amendments to the Consolidated School Law of Mount Vernon, on Wednesday evening. The principal amendments are those which empower the Board of Education to provide for the establishment and maintenance of the Free Public Library, there being nothing in the city charter or any other law of the city recognizing a public library. Assemblyman Stewart introduced the bill in the Senate. The bill will be held on Friday of this week. The success for full ticket will go to R. K. Smith, for corresponding secretary, and J. M. L. Conn, for treasurer.

"THE WORLD" PAYS THE PENALTY.

HARRIET MUNROE GETS \$5,000 FOR THE UNLAWFUL PUBLICATION OF HER POEM. By a decision in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Harriet Munroe has been awarded \$5,000 damages against "The New-York World." The action having been begun "for damages for unlawful publishing a poem written by the plaintiff, to be delivered on the occasion of the dedication of the Columbian Exposition, or of the World's Fair, in Chicago." The case has been before the United States Circuit Court for some time, and judgment was rendered against "The World" on December 13, 1894. An appeal was taken, with the result here given, Judges Wallace, Lacombe and Shipman declaring that "The World" should pay the damages demanded. Following are the important points in the text of the decision: At the time when preparations were being made for the opening ceremonies of the World's Fair it was suggested that the Exposition Company should have the right to furnish copies for publication to the newspapers. On September 23, the day when the money was paid for the ode, "The World" had a copy of it made, and although formally warned against violating the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was the wish of both author and Exposition Company to withhold the ode from publication until it should have been presented to the audience on the opening day of the Exposition. The managing editor of "The World" testified that he knew the ode belonged to the World's Fair and that he believed under certain conditions he had a right to publish a person's manuscript without the person's consent. Testimony such as this, says the opinion, was abundantly sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the publication of the ode was a violation of the author's rights. The defendant's violation of the author's rights, published it on Sunday, September 25. The testimony in the trial warranted the jury in finding that the defendant had reason to know that it was